

Comment Set 14, cont.

Ms. Judy Brown
July 22, 2003
Page 13 of 30

underneath the slough alignments and the routing of the trenched portion of the pipeline offset from the existing Peyton Slough, the proposed pipeline alignment would be outside the limits of the remediation work area itself. As a result, both SFPP and Rhodia believe that both projects can proceed independently without impact to one another."

14-20

Without further detail, it is impossible to conclude that both projects can proceed independently without impacting one another. See general comments and specific comment B-5. The project proponent has not provided Rhodia with information sufficient to support the last sentence in the above passage. Therefore, Rhodia has no present belief in the accuracy or inaccuracy of that statement. As set forth elsewhere Rhodia believes that there are Segment 1 pipeline alignment alternatives available to the project proponent that would avoid cumulative impacts to the sensitive wetlands that are the subject of Rhodia's remediation and restoration, and that such alternatives would better serve the public interests at stake in the Proposed Project as well as in connection with the remediation and restoration project.

Comment B-5. Page B-17. Phase 1 Carquinez Strait Crossing. Fifth paragraph.

14-21

The fifth paragraph reads:

"Rhodia's remediation plan includes a relocation of Peyton Slough itself. The timing of SFPP's HDD beneath the new and old Peyton Slough channels may occur independent of Rhodia's project activities, except that the precise location of and access to the drill pit on Rhodia property would need to be coordinated to avoid conflicts with Rhodia's project staging and laydown activities. Pipeline trenching along the west side of the existing Peyton Slough would need to occur either before or after Rhodia work to remove dredge spoils and cap the existing slough. SFPP and Rhodia have agreed to coordinate construction of their respective projects to avoid potential conflicts."

The impacts associated with coordination of construction, or lack of it, have not been identified or evaluated. This will not be possible without further detail. Please refer to the General Comments and specific comment B-4. Coordination activities associated with construction issues have not been identified or agreed to. Rhodia is not aware of any construction coordination agreement; however, Rhodia and SFPP have agreed to continued communications regarding the two projects. In the course of these general communications, Rhodia has provided the project proponent with all of the data it has requested in connection with the Peyton Slough Remediation and Restoration Project. Rhodia has not received comparable information concerning the SFPP Project from SFPP, or any other party. In any event, the impacts associated with coordination or independent construction activities have not been identified or evaluated in this Draft EIR.

Comment Set 14, cont.

Ms. Judy Brown
July 22, 2003
Page 14 of 30

Comment B-6. Page B-18. Section B.3.2. Carquinez Strait Crossing: Phase 1 and Phase 2. Phase 2 Carquinez Strait Crossing. Third bullet.

14-22

The third bullet reads, *"The technology for horizontal directional drilling currently does not allow certainty for a single 6,000 foot drill. As HDD technology is enhanced, SFPP will propose this technology to install the new 20-inch pipe underneath the Carquinez Strait using a single HDD. A separate and subsequent CEQA analysis would be prepared in the future to analyze the potential environmental impacts of a new pipeline crossing of the Carquinez Strait."*

As the Proposed Project is described (subsequent CEQA documents notwithstanding), it does not appear that feasible construction alternatives for the Carquinez Strait Crossing have been identified or developed in the event that a single HDD (as referenced in connection with Phase 2) is not technically practicable at such time when the existing 14-inch pipeline may become unsafe for continued use. It also appears that there may be some relationship between the proposed Phase 2 drilling operations in the tidal wetlands in the Peyton Slough Remediation and Restoration Area and the location of the portion of proposed Segment 1 (and its alternative) between MP 3 and MP 5. Given the state of the technology, it does not appear necessary to follow Segment 1 of the Proposed Project and alternative alignments in such proximity to the remediation and restoration project. As an alternative alignment for this vicinity, the proponent should consider following a course in or adjacent to the project proponent's existing pipeline right of way – a course which would avoid proximity to the wetlands and related impacts. As stated above, Rhodia believes that the Draft EIR may improperly segment Phase 2 from Phase 1. In any event, if the Phase 2 CEQA study is premature at this time, as the project proponent suggests in the Draft EIR, then the location of the alignment for Phase 1 should not be affected by Phase 2. If Phase 2 is now at issue, then its impacts should be studied and included in this Draft EIR.

Comment B-7. Page B-18. Phase 2 Carquinez Strait Crossing. First paragraph after the bullets.

14-23

The first paragraph, last sentence states, *"In addition to the pipeline construction itself, space must be allowed on the south shore of the Strait for the layout of a 50-foot wide 6,200-foot long temporary laydown area for the pipe string that would be pulled across the Strait."*

Then on Page C-14, Section 3.2.2 Water Crossings, the second sentence reads, *"These crossings would range from 25 to 50-foot creek or canal crossings to a 6,925-foot crossing of the Carquinez Strait."*

There appears to be a discrepancy in the length of the Phase 2 crossing and that the size of the workspace appears to be understated. Please also refer to Comment B-10.

Comment Set 14, cont.

Ms. Judy Brown
July 22, 2003
Page 15 of 30

Based on the available space in Peyton Marsh, there may be insufficient space for pipe stringing for the Proposed Project, Phase 2 Carquinez Strait Crossing.

14-23

As stated in Comment B-6, it appears that there may be some relationship between the proposed Phase 2 drilling operations in the tidal wetlands in the Peyton Slough Remediation and Restoration Project area and the location of the portion of proposed Segment 1 (and its alternative) between MP 3 and MP 5. Given the state of the technology, it does not appear necessary to follow Segment 1 of the Proposed Project and alternative alignments in such proximity to the remediation and restoration project. As an alternative alignment for this vicinity, the proponent should consider following a course in or adjacent to the project proponent's existing pipeline right of way – a course which would avoid proximity to the wetlands and related impacts. As stated above, Rhodia believes that the Draft EIR may improperly segment Phase 2 from Phase 1. In any event, if the Phase 2 CEQA study is premature at this time, as the project proponent suggests in the Draft EIR, then the location of the alignment for Phase 1 should not be affected by Phase 2. If Phase 2 is now at issue, then its impacts should be studied and included in this Draft EIR.

Comment B-8. Page B-18. Phase 2 Carquinez Strait Crossing. Third paragraph after the bullets.

14-24

The first sentence states, *"Before the Phase 2 crossing is implemented, the major remediation effort currently underway at the Rhodia site (from approximately MP 4.1 to 5.0) would result in the relocation of Peyton Slough."*

The remediation construction has not yet begun.

Comment B-9. Page B-18. Phase 2 Carquinez Strait Crossing. Third paragraph after the bullets.

14-25

The second and third sentences read, *"The new location of Peyton Slough will be about 500 feet east of the location of the Phase 2 pipeline and work area. Therefore, the Phase 2 construction would not cross the slough itself."*

The new channel appears to be as close as 10 to 15 feet from the south end of the Pipe Stringing Area shown on Figure B-6, Page B-19. (Please note: The proposed new Peyton Slough channel is shown incorrectly on Figure B-6.) At approximately MP 4, the total distance between the new and old Peyton Sloughs is approximately 30 to 40 feet. This is approximately where the Phase I alignment crosses the existing Peyton Slough. This area is targeted for restoration to salt marsh harvest mouse habitat. It is likely that the equipment access for Phase 2 will require a significantly wider access route, and if this area is used for pipe laydown, it will certainly impact areas subject to remediation and restoration in the old Peyton Slough channel, the mouse habitat restoration area,

Comment Set 14, cont.

Ms. Judy Brown
July 22, 2003
Page 16 of 30

and the realigned Peyton Slough. The degree or magnitude of impacts within this sensitive area has not been analyzed in this document.

14-25

As stated in the prior two comments, it appears that there may be some relationship between the proposed Phase 2 drilling operations in the tidal wetlands in the Peyton Slough Remediation and Restoration Project area and the location of the portion of proposed Segment 1 (and its alternative) between MP 3 and MP 5. Given the state of the technology, it does not appear necessary to follow Segment 1 of the Proposed Project and alternative alignments in such proximity to the remediation and restoration project. As an alternative alignment for this vicinity, the proponent should consider following a course in or adjacent to the project proponent's existing pipeline right of way – a course which would avoid proximity to the wetlands and related impacts. As stated above, Rhodia believes that the Draft EIR may improperly segment Phase 2 from Phase 1. In any event, if the Phase 2 CEQA study is premature at this time, as the project proponent suggests in the Draft EIR, then the location of the alignment for Phase 1 should not be affected by Phase 2. If Phase 2 is now at issue, then its impacts should be studied and included in this Draft EIR.

Comment B-10. Page B-22. Section B.3.4. Decommissioning of the Existing 14-Inch Pipeline. First paragraph.

14-26

The first paragraph state, "After construction of the new 20-inch pipeline is complete, with the exception of the portion across the Carquinez Strait, the existing 14-inch pipeline would be decommissioned (taken out of service). Petroleum in the portion of the existing 14-inch pipeline that would no longer be used would be displaced using nitrogen into storage tanks at SFPP delivery points. Once the pipeline is evacuated and purged of petroleum product, the tie-in points at Concord and Sacramento Station and on either side of the Carquinez Strait would be disconnected and sealed off. The purged, sealed pipeline would be shut in and left with positive nitrogen pressure to eliminate the potential of future internal corrosion. In addition, the decommissioning of the existing Elmira Booster Pump Station would consist of draining the station piping, blinding the tie-in piping from the 14-inch line, and removing major equipment."

The impacts from decommissioning the existing 14-inch pipeline and from removing major equipment in Segment 1, as compared to using the project proponent's existing pipeline right of way in Segment 1, have not been evaluated. This is a particularly important in Segment 1 from approximately MP 3 to 5, where the Proposed Project traverses Peyton Marsh and Slough which is sensitive wetland habitat.

Comment Set 14, cont.

Ms. Judy Brown
July 22, 2003
Page 17 of 30

COMMENTS TO SECTION C

Comment C-1. Section C. Alternatives.

This section does not appear to address the use of the Existing Pipeline ROW for Segment 1. Because Segment 1 traverses a sensitive wetland, Peyton Marsh and Slough, the project proponents existing pipeline right of way is an obvious alternative to the Proposed Project and to the "Existing Pipeline ROW Alternative" in Segment 1. This alternative for Segment 1 has not been analyzed as part of this CEQA document.

14-27

Comment C-2. Page C-2. Section C.1.2.1. Significant Environmental Effects of the Proposed Project.

The following significant environmental effects of the Proposed Project have not been identified or evaluated:

14-28

- Impacts on ongoing remediation and restoration activities
- Potential of exacerbation of existing contamination
- Potential for operation accidents (product spill, fire) to cause cumulative impacts to surrounding industries

Comment C-3. Page C-8. Subsection Contamination. 2nd paragraph.

The second paragraph states:

14-29

"Constructing a pipeline near a Superfund site is considered a constraint because contaminated soils and hazardous soil vapors, which could significantly slow construction, could be encountered. The crew working in the area would likely require hazardous materials health and safety training. In addition special soil handling practices and chemical lab analysis would be required for potentially contaminated soil and groundwater encountered during construction. There may also be a potential additional cost related to the hazardous waste disposal. Constructing a pipeline near a Superfund site may require additional requirements with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and/or the Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC). A one-half mile radius from this alternative was researched for Superfund sites."

Likewise, due to the close proximity of Segment 1 to the Peyton Slough, which is an RWQCB Toxic Hot Spot, the Peyton Slough Remediation and Restoration Project may pose a similar constraint which has not been evaluated. Alternative analysis and impact analysis have not been performed to evaluate the extent to which the Proposed Project would affect this remediation project, which is of regional significance and is taking place in a sensitive wetland habitat.